

REMARKS

Claims 20, 24-54 and 57-64 are pending, with claims 20, 33, 44, 51, 57 and 61 being independent. Claims 1-11, 19, 55 and 56 have been canceled.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 20 and 51-54.

Claims 24-49 and 57-64 have been rejected as being anticipated by Jung (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002-0018912A).

With respect to independent claims 33 and 44, and their dependent claims, applicant again requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Jung does not describe or suggest forming a mixed region comprising a mixture of first and second organic compounds during irradiation with light in the deposition chamber, as recited in independent claims 33 and 44. Rather, as previously noted, Jung describes formation of a polymer thin film that, as noted in paragraph [0036] of Jung, may include the simultaneous deposition of two or more organic compounds. A polymer (i.e., "a naturally occurring or synthetic substance consisting of giant molecules formed from polymerization") is significantly different from a mixture (i.e., "a substance containing two or more ingredients: distinguished from a compound in that the constituents are not in fixed proportions, do not lose their individual characteristics, and can be separated by physical means"). Jung's polymer thin film is not a mixture and does not have the properties of a mixture. For example, once polymerization has occurred to form the polymer thin film, the two or more constituent organic compounds used to form the polymer thin film would not seem to be separable by physical means.

In response to these arguments, the rejection once again asserts, without explanation, that it is inherent that Jung's device includes a mixed region of first and second organic compounds. As support for this position, the rejection points to the last three lines of paragraph [0036] of Jung. However, as noted above, these lines merely support the notion that Jung's polymer may be formed from the first and second organic compounds, and do not address Jung's failure to describe or suggest a mixed region comprising a mixture of first and second organic compounds.

Applicant also again requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 33 and 44, and their dependent claims, for the additional reason that Jung does not describe or suggest irradiating to activate the organic compound molecules and promote compact film formation. This irradiation and the resulting compactness is illustrated in Fig. 3A of the application and discussed, for example, at paragraphs [0063] to [0066]. Jung simply does not describe such activating of the organic compound or compacting of the film. Though the rejection indicates that Jung teaches irradiation during deposition to result in compact film formation, Jung nowhere indicates that compact film formation is promoted. In particular, while the rejection indicates that such compact film formation is shown in Fig. 2 and the related description and paragraph [0062] of Jung, these passages make no mention of compact film formation. Notably, the Examiner has provided no response to these arguments.

Accordingly, for at least these reason, the rejection of claims 33 and 44, and their dependent claims, should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 57 recites compacting a layer of a compound by irradiating light to form a compacted layer comprising the compound. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 57 and its dependent claims should be withdrawn because, as discussed above, Jung does not describe or suggest such compacting.

Independent claim 61 recites forming a layer comprising a mixture of first and second compounds and irradiating with light to form a compacted layer comprising the mixture. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 61 and its dependent claims should be withdrawn because, as discussed above, Jung does not describe or suggest forming a layer comprising a mixture or compacting.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki et al.
Serial No. : 10/081,971
Filed : February 20, 2002
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-303001 / US5537

The fees in the amount of \$1240 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee (\$450) and the Request for Continued Examination fee (\$790) are being paid concurrently herewith on the electronic filing system (EFS) by way of deposit account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,



John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Date: July 12, 2007

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40427317.doc